

REMARKS:

Claims 8-19 are presented for examination. Claims 8 and 14 have been amended hereby. Claims 1-7 have previously been cancelled (without prejudice or disclaimer).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 8-12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,435,031, hereinafter “Black et al.”.

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner’s analysis of the claims of the present application and the Black et al. reference.

For example, at page 2 of the September 22, 2008 Office Action the Examiner appears to assert that the inertial unit of claim 8 is disclosed by element 66 of the Black et al. reference. The Examiner’s attention is directed, however, to col. 3, lines 62-63 of the Black et al. reference where this element 66 is referred to simply as a “circuit board”. It is respectfully submitted that such a “circuit board” clearly does not disclose the specifically claimed “aircraft inertial unit” (claim 8 has been amended hereby to be even more patentably distinct by reciting aircraft inertial unit).

Further, with regard to independent claim 14, at page 3 of the September 22, 2008 Office Action the Examiner appears to assert that the inertial unit of independent claim 14 is disclosed by element 60 of the Black et al. reference. The Examiner’s attention is directed, however, to col. 3, line 55 of the Black et al. reference where this element 60 is referred to simply as a “connector block”. It is respectfully submitted that such a “connector block” clearly does not disclose the claimed “aircraft inertial unit” (claim 14 has been amended hereby to be even more patentably distinct by reciting aircraft inertial unit).

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 8 and 14 (as well as claims 9-12 and 15-18, depending therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Black et al. has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Black et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,962,775, hereinafter “King, Jr.”

Initially, it is noted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner’s analysis of claims 13 and 19 and the Black et al. and King, Jr. references.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, it will simply be noted that claim 13 depends (indirectly) from independent claim 8 and claim 19 depends (indirectly) from independent claim 14.

Thus, each of claims 13 and 19 is submitted to be patentably distinct for at least the same

reasons as the independent claim from which it depends.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Black et al. in view of King, Jr. has been overcome.

Finally, it is noted that this Amendment is fully supported by the originally filed application and thus, no new matter has been added. For this reason, the Amendment should be entered.

For example, support for the amendments to claims 8 and 14 regarding the rack being a support rack may be found at page 1, lines 10-24.

Further, support for the amendments to claims 8 and 14 regarding the inertial unit being an aircraft inertial unit may be found at page 1, lines 10-24.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each rejection raised by the Examiner in the September 22, 2008 Office Action has been overcome and that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

By: /Matthew B. Tropper/
Matthew B. Tropper
Registration No. 37,457

Dated: December 19, 2008

Mailing Address:
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
MetLife Building
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 801-2100
Facsimile: (212) 801-6400